GCP-2 (Crushing and Screening), GCP-3 (Hot Mix Asphalt Plant, and GCP-5 (Concrete Batch Plant)
Public Response During Comment Period and Public Meetings

Paragraph	Applies to GCP 2	3	5	Issue	Resolution/Rationale
General Note	X	X	X	Numbering	Paragraph numbering has changed in some places such that the issue being addressed in this matrix is no longer reflected in the current draft documents. Requirements are generally in the same location, and always in the same subparagraph [Roman Numeral.Alpha Character]
General	X	X	X	It would really help if small plants could request a "courtesy inspection," where without risk, the Bureau would come out, review the facility, and tell them what they need to do to come into compliance.	People within the Air Quality Bureau agree that this would be a good idea, but we do not have enough people to do this for everyone. We will try to accommodate the "need" by other means. Ideas being discussed include: Training (either a booklet or video) on what the GCP requires, Examples of completed forms, Examples of recordkeeping, Publish a supporting document in plain language called "GCP-5 Instructions and Guidance," Include drawings that illustrate what the various location terms refer to. In addition, our small business office will try to help by sending information and answering questions over the phone.
General	X	X	X	What about pre-existing plants with smaller yardage. Why does a plant that produces 5,000 to 10,000 yards per year have to do everything that is required of a plant producing 50,000 – 200,000 yards per year. Will there be size-based permit options?	There will not be different permits, but recognizing that smaller facilities produce proportionally smaller emissions, some requirements will not apply to smaller facilities.
General			X	Could you lengthen the period to come into	Our delegation from EPA does not give us

Paragraph	Applies to GCP 2	3	5	Issue	Resolution/Rationale
				compliance? The GCP permit fee is certainly reasonable compared to a regular Construction Permit (and especially with the small business discount). We like the simplicity and the fact that we can avoid modeling, and consultants. However, the overall cost is still too high for small businesses. Beyond the permit fee, cost of application, and annual fee, there is a cost of compliance. Buying all of the specified equipment will shut small businesses down – especially if you don't give them 4 – 5 years to come into compliance, so they can amortize the expense over several years of income.	discretion over when or whether a facility must come into compliance. Lengthening the period for compliance would also be impractical, requiring the operator and NMED to track an implementation schedule for each facility. Based on smaller emissions, the department has exempted Smaller facilities from some of the requirements. (See subsection I.E.)
General			X	Why can't portable plants be exempt from some requirements? Other states define a portable plant, such that "it cannot operate in the same place for more than 6 months, or the duration of the project."	All plants must comply, however, smaller "portable" plants may gain some relief from the exemptions in Subsection I.E.
General	X	X	X	Could you hold more meetings like this around the state?	Additional meetings will be arranged in conjunction with the New Mexico Readymix Assn.
General	X	X	X	I have a general comment about GCP emissions. Will the GCP emissions be listed as 95 TPH in databases? If so, the surrounding sources and cumulative modeling analysis will have problems for NO2 and potentially for nearby TSP sources.	It is a department directive from the Bureau Chief, that all applications be logged in TEMPO with the PTE. Therefore, the emissions will be listed at the maximum. Our inventory would use "actuals"; but we do not anticipate including these sources in our inventory.
I.A.3			X	Suggest striking the words "and no others" to avoid excluding someone who has other	The first page of the GCP states that the Department issues GCPs "to register groups of

Paragraph	Applies to GCP 2	3	5	Issue	Resolution/Rationale
				equipment.	sources that have similar operations, processes, and emissions and that are subject to the same or substantially similar requirements." The Department has studied the operation of numerous operating batch plants, and finds this list to be representative. Some room has been left for interpretation. (e.g. (c), (j), (k), (m), and (p). Furthermore, it is not the intent of the Department to make this GCP applicable to every single concrete plant in the state; only those that operate in a similar fashion. All of our analysis, modeling, and selection of limits and controls is based on this list.
I.A.3.a	X	X	X	Why is the throughput limited for the various facilities, if not related to EPA National Air Quality Standards?	The term "production rate" has been substituted for "throughput." The AQB has modeled emissions under various operating scenarios to preclude plant-specific modeling for GCP applicants. The production limit defines an upper boundary where modeling shows that one (or a combination of several) types of emissions will exceed what we are comfortable permitting under a GCP.
I.A.3.a			X	The restriction of 200 YPH seems too small and unrelated to Ambient Air Quality Standards or to PSD. Suggest changing the limitation to 2400 YPD.	The GCP restriction has been revised to 2400 YPD. A rating in YPH was initially chosen because plants are purchased from a manufacturer with such a rating. The Department recognizes that in reality, plants cannot produce at the theoretic rate, but plate information still produces a common

Paragraph	Applies to GCP 2	3	5	Issue	Resolution/Rationale
					measurement. There is a relationship between the 200 YPH and 2400 YPD, based on assumed operation at the maximum rated capacity for 12 hours per day. This production would be unusual: occurring during very large pours or where structural integrity (i.e continuous pour) is critical. Note that the Department did not limit production to 12 hours per day; we merely use that assumption as a basis for calculations. The 200 YPH limit does not overly constraining the New Mexico concrete industry. We looked at our database entries, and excluding Albuquerque and Bernalillo County (where we do not have jurisdiction), the 200 YPH cap would accommodate 85 – 90% of the existing plants – a reasonable rate for a GCP. Lastly, we considered public interest if plants are permitted under this expedited process. Traffic, noise and dust are the principle irritants to neighbors. While we do not regulate traffic or noise, they are inextricably linked to what is permited. A 200 YPH plant, counting delivery of cement and aggregate, empty trucks arriving, and full trucks leaving, could result in up to 50 haul-road trips per hour, nearly 1 every minute. In conjunction with other calculations, we concluded that a 200 YPH cap was reasonable accommodation for an optional permit, where

Paragraph	Applies to GCP 2	3	5	Issue	Resolution/Rationale
					there are other permitting alternatives.
I.A.3.g			X	Suggest that you drop the limitation of 25 MMBTU from this item as it could not contribute to any air quality problem or amount to 95 TPY NOx or CO.	This permit is not for the boiler; it is for the entire facility and the boiler emissions contribute to the total. We researched the 25 MMBTU number in advance and it appears generous enough to accommodate most plants. (We received no other comments about this parameter from industry.)
I.A.3.h	X	X	X	Suggest that you research the 180 hp limitation on this item to ensure that it is not an arbitrary requirement and it does not exclude everyone. Is this the site rating or the manufacturer's rating	The requirement was initially set at 180 hp to minimize testing requirements. (Based Title V calculation methodology, a 180 hp engine would produce just under 25 TPY of NOx, avoiding the need to test. Initial research indicated that 180 hp engines would accommodate most of the industry and it seemed generous since we had never permitted a larger one. However, we received several similar comments about this parameter. The extreme circumstance would seem to be a portable plant, not connected to the power grid, where all electrical input would have to be derived from an engine driven generator, though this circumstance could be considered to be a non-standard outlier. We will relax this parameter slightly; however, this GCP may not accommodate all situations, and since the 180 hp number was used to calculate Facility emissions, other parameters may change as a consequence.

Paragraph	Applies to GCP 2	3	5	Issue	Resolution/Rationale
I.B.5	X		X	What fraction are we talking about? There may be some percent of HAPs in NM soils. Fly Ash contains some HAPs and TAPs. Hopefully the quantity used and the concentration is not high	On a requirement level, the HAP/TAP portion of fly ash released from the Filter would not reach the 5 TPY threshold requiring the facilities to be permitted for toxic air pollutants.
I.B.11	X			Why can't humates be included under GCP-2?	Humates have notably different material property and do not fit the generic envelope of this GCP. The Department has limited knowledge and mixed experience with Humate operations, and is therefore not comfortable including them in this GCP.
I.B.12	X			Is this exclusion because a 'fuel fired dryer' would be part of another GCP for asphalt plants?	It doesn't fit within the defined generic envelope. The department would have to do other calculations and establish other conditions if fuel-fired dryers were to be included.
II	X	X	X	Is it possible to permit a plant without an immediate location, and then submit the location later as long as it meets the modeling and permit requirements of GCP-5?	An initial location must be declared, and that location must meet the requirements of the GCP. Public notice would have to be given for that location, even if it was a storage yard and no production was intended. The Permit allows the plant to be moved to another location, whether or not it was ever constructed and operated at the initial location. Public notice would have to be given for the new location, and the Department would have to be notified.
II.A.1	X	X	X	Suggest that you include a list of the field offices on the registration form.	Field office contact information is on our website and will be added to the guidance document for each GCP. Including them in the Permit would require the Permit to be updated if an office moves

Paragraph	Applies to GCP 2	3	5	Issue	Resolution/Rationale
					to a different address.
II.A.1	X	X	X	A form is either current or not current. If you prefer the word 'most', perhaps you should say "most recent."	The suggested wording is better, and has been used.
II.A.1	X	X	X	The phrase about application and permit return and retention is repeated in III.A.5.	The first occurrence describes the process but it is not necessary to state the future action. The second occurrence is an operating requirement so the entire phrase has been left there.
II.B	X	X	X	Does the 15 day prior notification period refer to the applicant's submittal to the Department, or with the Department's reply?	The language in the GCP has been clarified. The 15 days is intended to give the public an opportunity to comment on the proposed permit. The "15 day prior" requirement means 15 days prior to the Applicant's submittal to the Department, so the Department can consider the application and comments simultaneously and before making a decision.
I.B.5 & III.B.8 III.A.7	X	X		GCP-2 and 3 do not allowed night time operation but GCP-5 does. For purposes of co-location (e.g. on a road project where the contract requires recycling and has penalties for delay) why can't this be changed?	Nighttime operation was precluded for GCP-2 and GCP-5 because opacity tests cannot be performed to verify the key requirement for "no visible emissions." This restriction may be reconsidered in a subsequent revision.
II.C.1.a	X	X	X	The first sentence sounds as if the completed forms are available on the website. Suggest adding "if available" after "e-mail address" on the registration form.	1st Sentence has been changed to read: "GCP-2 forms, available from the website, shall be completed with the following information and attachments and submitted to the address on the registration form." If the contact person does not have an email address, this can be left blank.

Paragraph	Applies to GCP 2	3	5	Issue	Resolution/Rationale
				Should it be 'Fax' or 'facsimile'?	The term Fax seems to be in common use and is applied on all of the Department's documentation.
II.C.1.d	X	X	X	EPA Databases and TEMPO require NAICS codes as well	We do not anticipate including these sources in our inventory.
II.C.3.a&b	X	X	X	Why is the facility location required in both Section, Range, Township, UTM, and latitude/longitude?	The Department must report locations in each of these coordinate systems to comply with various EPA requirements. Since the turn-around on the GCPs is rapid, it is better to have the applicant provided consistent locations in all units.
II.C.3.b	X	X	X	This is a pet peeve of people who do GIS and modeling. I am not sure if the UTM is for the center of the facility or a mail gate. Also is the NAD standard specified; i.e. is this NAD83 or NAD27? These can differ almost 200 m sometimes.	The wording has been clarified to indicate that the desired coordinates are for the center of the facility and either coordinate system is acceptable, but the applicant must specify which system is being used.
II.C.3.e	X	X	X	Suggest that you delete this item since it is unrelated to ambient standards or PSD increment.	This piece of information is related to a subsequent requirement, and must be established at the time of application. It is to the benefit of the permittee to establish the initial condition, in the event that someone moves closer to the facility in future years.
II.C.3.h	X	X	X	Has the modeling analysis been done to determine whether a facility with 94 TPH NOx emissions would pass the Class I annual standard of 2.5 ug/m3 in a complex terrain?	We did conduct a NOx analysis and are confident that with the mandatory 3-mile separation between the permitted facility and any Class I area, that NOx will not exceed Federal Standards. In addition, our analysis shows that for all three types of facilities, other pollutants will reach the 95 TPY cap before NOx does.
II.C.5.a			X	Suggest this item be dropped, or at least clarify	The wording has been changed to YPD (yards per

Paragraph	Applies to GCP 2	3	5	Issue	Resolution/Rationale
				the associated time period. Unclear whether you mean measured throughput in any one hour or daily average in cubic yards per hour.	day) and YPY (yards per year). This number now refers to the "proposed" production rate rather than the factory rated capacity. Both of these parameters are used to characterize the Facility emissions, establish Small Business Status and fees, and to determine the applicability of other requirements.
II.C.5.g			X	Suggest this item be dropped, since some pieces of equipment are capable of handling more material per hour than others. It could cause confusion between the overall production throughput and that of the individual components	Wording has been changed slightly. The requirement is clearly asking for the design capacity for each piece of equipment. It is understood by the Department that individual pieces of equipment will have different capacities.
II.C.5.h		X	X	Needs more thought. For older equipment specs may not be available or, if they are, may be idealized for new, optimum conditions. Need to establish a working range for continual operation, appropriate to the kind of filter being used. (perhaps only high-end?) that is allowable. [Suggestions at the public meeting included: "2-3 inches is clean." "Other states require from 1-5 inches." "4-inches is marginal."]	The requirement has been changed to say: "…are unavailable or are no longer relevant…" and to allow the facility to establish an effective working range by testing (rather than a single point).
II.D.3		X	X	It seems unreasonable to access full fees for all subsequent years, if the 330,000 YPY is exceeded in only one year. [Another individual:] It would be nice to have some flexibility as a small business for future years in case the	The wording has been clarified. Small business status during the first year will be based on projected production (II.C.5.a) from the registration form. All subsequent years will be based on the total actual production for the previous year. If a small business slips over the 330,000 yard threshold in year (A), it must notify

Paragraph	Applies to GCP 2	3	5	Issue	Resolution/Rationale
				company scales down its production or the market is bad.	the Department and will be required to pay the full fee in year (B). However, if the production during year (B) is below the threshold, the permitted facility may notify the department or ask for a corrected invoice, and the status/fee will revert to small business in Year (C).
III.A.1			X	The language and cited paragraphs combine to create a problem if a component fails and the plant must shut down for 15 DAYS for prior Bureau approval.	The wording in Subsection IV.C, has been changed to say: "…Prior to but no earlier than fifteen (15) days before any changes in equipment…" With this language, notification of an equipment change may be sent immediately when the original component fails, but before the new unit is put into operation. There is not a waiting period for Department approval.
III.A.3		X		Asphalt plants typically use "burner fuel" which is not included in this list. The waste oil meets the 0.05% requirement for sulfur. Can it be added? {Another individual} The requirement says diesel fuel with sulfur content less that 0.05%. How do we prove that?	The Asphalt industry uses the term "burner fuel" to describe recycled or re-used "waste oil." CFR 40 CFR § 279 governs all aspects of collection, treatment, transport, storage, testing, marketing and burning waste oil. GCP-3 has been changed to allow the use of "on-specification" waste oil. [Note: Other aspects of 40 CFR § 279 are applicable to buyers, sellers, and users of used oil, but are not under the purview of AQB.] Any diesel manufactured today has to be less than 0.05%, and an invoice that says "diesel" will be construed to meet the requirement.)
III.A.3		X		States to only use natural gas, gasoline, propane/LPG and / or diesel fuel. Request that	The use of "on-specification" waste oil has been added, with a corresponding recordkeeping

Paragraph	Applies to GCP 2	3	5	Issue	Resolution/Rationale
				burner fuel be included in the list of allowable fuel sources.	requirement.
III.A.4	X	X	X	Suggest that you use this daily limitation rather than hourly, as discussed above.	The requirement has been changed to reflect a daily limitation.
III.A.4			X	Suggest, given the small setback distances, that you create at least one more level of operation. 3200 YPD would expand the ability of people to use this permit.	Based on all factors (discussed throughout this document, the Department feels that it has gone a far as it can with this GCP, and that 85% of the plants in New Mexico will be able to use it.
III.A.6	X	X	X	The rqmt. Specified Method 22. The implied linkage to angle restriction in Method 9 is not specified but should be.	Method 22 requires the observer to be familiar with Method 9 and its requirements. However, Facility location, layout, access restrictions, and surrounding private property under different ownership sometimes preclude observations in full compliance with Method 9. The department will not impose Method 9 as an absolute requirement.
III.A.6	X	X	X	How will the requirement for "no visible emissions" work for material stock piled next to the property line if it blows across the fence?	First, a clarification: The no visible emissions requirement refers to the "restricted area," not the property boundary. (see definitions at the back of the GCP.) While in many cases the two may be one and the same, the restricted area is a smaller area inside of a larger property. Having said that, if a stockpile is close to the perimeter of the "restricted area," the owner/operator is responsible for visible emissions that blow across that line.
III.A.6	X	X	X	What about material blowing <u>onto</u> and across the property?	NMED inspectors will not use such obviously ridiculous grounds for an enforcement action. Note however, that the GCP does impose responsibility on the owner/operator to take additional measures during high-wind conditions.

Paragraph	Applies to GCP 2	3	5	Issue	Resolution/Rationale
Tbl III.C.1			X	Suggest that another level of operation (3200 YPD) be added to this table with a corresponding column	The department is not comfortable with permitting facilities with production greater than 2400 YPD under this GCP.
Tbl III.C.1.c			X	The final criteria in this table precludes operation within ½ mile of another particulate emitting facility. There are two existing concrete batch plants under separate ownership operating across the fence from each other in the Rio Rancho industrial park. Which one of them needs to move?	After extensive discussion and analysis, the Department has decided to eliminate this requirement.
Tbl III.C.1.c			X	Given no visible emissions at the property boundary, I see no plausible reason for the ½ mile separation distance. Suggest you reduce this value or drop it.	The requirement has been eliminated.
III.E.			X	Some concrete plants wash sand at the facility. Suggest that you either add sand washing to the collocation or add that type of equipment to the allowable list in I.A.3. Rather than include sand washing under aggregate processing, I think it should be extended separate status.	Perhaps this will be considered in a subsequent revision to GCP-5. Sand washing was not considered in any of the existing analysis and the department is not familiar enough with the equipment/process to identify what additional emissions might occur.
III.E.	X	X	X	If three facilities collocate, per the 95 tons/year emission rates in Table III.G.1 , wouldn't a collocating facility have the potential to be a Title V source?	The Table language has been clarified to cap emissions from each Facility at a maximum of 95 tons per year. However, most facilities will emit less than that amount. It is not possible for three facilities to constitute a Title V source. In order to collocate, each Facility would first have to be in possession of its own permit. They would have to be different SIC codes. (The limit is one of each type: crusher,

Paragraph	Applies to GCP 2	3	5	Issue	Resolution/Rationale
					asphalt, and concrete.) They would not necessarily belong to the same owner. Under these circumstances, they could not constitute a Title V source.
Table III.E.1	X	X	X	Clarify what you mean by "Total Combined Production Limitation." Does it mean that each collocated plant must individually be less than the number in the table, OR that the combined total production of both plants must be less than the number in the table.	The table headings has been clarified. However, looking at this question highlighted an inconsistency on our part. GCP 2 and GCP3 both limit co-location to one plant of each type: 1 crusher/screen, 1 asphalt, and 1 concrete. The language in GCP5 was inconsistent, allowing 1 crusher/screen, 1 asphalt, and 2 concrete. This was not our intent, and GCP-5 has been revised to be consistent with the other two GCPs.
Table III.E.1	X	X	X	Should the units for concrete be yards per hour or tons per hour?	Concrete is mixed and sold in (cubic) yards and production is rated in Yards Per Hour (YPH)
Table III.E.1		X	X	Suggest you use a daily rather than hourly production as a cap, since hourly production varies widely for both concrete and asphalt plants.	The table has been changed to a daily cap.
III.E.1	X	X	X	What is your requirement basis for this limitation? Why do you care how many plants co-locate?	The Department has a requirement to protect the public as well as to accommodate the business community. Prior to the creation of GCP-5, we had only two types of facilities to consider so the co-location restrictions were simpler. The door is now open to three large particulate emitting facilities co-locating. Under a Regular permitting process, modeling would be required and there would be more time for public input. The Department does not want to create industrial

Paragraph	Applies to GCP 2	3	5	Issue	Resolution/Rationale
					"super-centers" under the fast-moving GCP process. The decision to limit is also based on the probable number of haul-road trips that would occur under the operational caps in this table. If more than three plants want to co-locate, the regular permitting process is available. If these GCPs are revised in the future, additional co-location restrictions may be added.
III.E.3	X	X	X	Suggest that you drop from this list: "schoolyard, private residence, office building, or other occupied structure." You have already restricted with "no visible emissions," so air quality is not an issue, and increasing the setbacks to ½ mile seems excessive.	The requirement has been changed to ¼ mile, consistent with GCP-2 and GCP-3. In GCP-2 and GCP-3, the ¼ mile requirement is embedded in Table III.C.1 as a siting restriction. GCP-5 does not make it a precondition for a single facility operating under this permit, but wants to clarify that the ¼ mile restriction does apply if a GCP-2 or GCP-3 facility is collocated with the concrete batch plant. Note that III.F.11 specifies additional road requirements to reduce fugitive dust, any time the separation between a Concrete Facility (located by itself) and the items listed in III.E.3 is less than uses ¼ mile.
III.F.			X	More thought required: much of this section is geared towards transit mix and would be unapplicable to Central Mix plants.	III.F.3 c, d, and e are specific to transit-mix facilities. All other requirements are applicable to either type of operation. The Department asked at the public meeting if anyone was aware of a central-mix plant operating in New Mexico, the response was negative.

Paragraph	Applies to GCP 2	3	5	Issue	Resolution/Rationale
					We could make an exclusionary statement for c, d, and e. On the other hand, there might be additional restrictions applicable to a central mix plant if we had one to evaluate. Lacking any immediate candidates, this issue will be addressed in future revisions, if necessary.
III.F.			X	In specifying required controls, your modeling should look at an operational limit (ceiling) that doesn't assume 24-7 operation for small plants	While operations were not restricted to daylight hours, the Department had never considered 24/7 operation. However, in response to this request, we have established a category in subsection I.E for smaller Facilities, based on calculated emissions with reduced production. Such Facilities are exempted from some requirements as long as they operate below the threshold in I.E. They must maintain records to substantiate this status, and must install additional equipment and notify the Department before exceeding the cap.
III.F.			X	You keep talking about modeling. What does modeling include?	Dispersion modeling is not required under the GCP. Most of the time when we mention "modeling" during these meetings it is emission calculations, ensuring that each facility will stay below certain emission levels. We characterize it as a model because it uses accepted factors for emission sources, controls, and looks at a variety of operational assumptions.
III.F.1			X	Bunkering should only be required for unwashed material.	The Department does not accept the premise that washed sand and aggregate eliminates all particulate problems. Course aggregate is not

Paragraph	Applies to GCP 2	3	5	Issue	Resolution/Rationale
				Bunkers 2-ft higher than the pile could be dangerous for big piles and effectiveness is questionable if wind comes from the open side. Wetting is as effective and is preferred as a requirement, though many plants will continue to use bunkers to separate different aggregate piles. Another individual: Plants create bunker "blocks" from left-over concrete that is returned to the plant. Newer plants don't automatically have them for a couple of years. Another individual: Can this be temporary walls made of corrugate metal that can be moved around?	commonly washed, and some fine siltaceous material remains even on washed sand and gravel. Department representatives were initially told that "by definition" Concrete Facilities have access water, wetting piles is not a problem, and operators prefer to mix with wet sand. However, it appears that under some circumstances, the "wetting" alternative also has potential drawbacks. An operator from Northern New Mexico pointed out that wetted sand would freeze in the winter, making it difficult, if not impossible, to use. He also mentioned that the latent heat of cold wet sand was not an advantage in the winter, when heated water is used to mix. As a result, wetted piles will not be an absolute in all places and at all times. The department observed bunkers at all facilities we visited, and knowing that they were made from scrap material, presumed that this requirement was easy to meet. We now recognize that a new plant might not initially have enough blocks to bunker all stockpiles; however, the material used to "bunker" is not prescribed so alternatives to concrete may be used. The point about bunker safety around tall piles is well taken, and the height requirement has been removed. The department thinks that bunkers, or some equivalent are a good practice for concrete

Paragraph	Applies to GCP 2	3	5	Issue	Resolution/Rationale
					Facilities. Allowing the base of an unconstrained stockpile to spread out, increases the surface area exposed to wind, and increases emissions. While bunkers are not 100% effective (particularly when the wind is coming from the open end), wind deflection is achieved 75% of the time. There are also ancillary benefits for the Owner/operator. Closely spaced piles separated by walls occupy a smaller footprint and reduce loader travel. The Department has eliminated the height requirement and does not specify materials for bunkers, allowing flexibility. Note however, that the Owner/operator is responsible for material blown from the piles that crosses the perimeter of the area of operations.
III.F.3.b	X	X	X	Washed sand (required under III.F.3.a) and washed aggregate have no fines. This is a waste of water. [another individual] Recommend that you allow several options for controlling fugitive dust including: wetting piles, using the three walled bunkers etc. [another individual] Wet aggregate will freeze in the winter, particularly wet sand will freeze 2-ft deep in Taos. Wetting aggregate in the summer is useful	[See also the discussion in the previous item.] Observations made by the Department, and discussion at the public meeting, confirm that washed sand is common, but washed aggregate is unusual. Even washed material contains some fines that will blow under high wind conditions. Industry representatives also said that (with some exceptions) wetted sand was preferable for mixing, and that by definition, concrete batch plants had to have sufficient water to produce the product, whether it was applied at the storage pile, in the mixer, or some of both.

Paragraph	Applies to GCP 2	3	5	Issue	Resolution/Rationale
				for two reasons: it mixes better in the truck and it is cooler so it doesn't start to set up as quickly during transit. Cool has no value in the winter, and frozen "chunks" of sand don't mix at all.	The Department has changed the wording to say: "Keep sand and aggregate piles controlled during hours of operation" (as necessary to comply with III.A.6). The amount and frequency of water application is left to the owner/operator, <u>who remains responsible for emissions crossing the Area of Operations perimeter.</u>
III.F.8		X	X	States that each silo shall be equipped with both audible and visible alarm. Recommend changing wording to allow either "visible" or "audible" The requirement specifies audible and visible alarms. Why both? It would cost over $3,000 to install this.	Overfilling a silo is one of the worst causes of fine PM emissions, and it is totally preventable if the cement delivery truck shuts down before overfilling. Overfilling also wastes product. The department might accept the recommendation if there was a way to ensure that the truck driver would remain next to the loading process, paying attention to the visible alarm. However, drivers have been known to go inside the building for periods of time, leaving the loading process unsupervised and rendering a visible alarm ineffective. The proposed cost seems unrealistically high. One "full silo" indicator can switch on two devices as easily as one, and a horn doesn't cost $3000. This requirement is important to the Department, and requiring audible/visual alarms is probably more acceptable to the Facility than being held responsible for the actions of the driver who is not an employee.

Paragraph	Applies to GCP 2	3	5	Issue	Resolution/Rationale
III.F.3		X		Why does this need to be 5%? Doesn't the requirement for "no visible emissions across the property boundary" cover the need? A consultant recalls that the history of this requirement was to force baghouses on asphalt drum dryers. There was no intent at that time that it should apply to screens.	Our requirement says "no visible emissions from processing equipment. We have looked through the hearing records and can find no exhibits or testimony that limit the intent or applicability to Asphalt drum plants.
III.F.3		X		What is the standard if the emissions are controlled by a wet scrubbing device?	Per 40 CFR §60.92 (Asphalt) and 40 CFR §60.672 (Crushers) the particulate standard is the same. The opacity standard is not applicable, but additional recordkeeping requirements are imposed in paragraph IV.B.3.k and IV.B.3.j respectively.
III.F.3		X		States that particulate emissions shall not exceed 5% opacity. Since the foundation for this limit is a vague state regulation (20.2.11.109 NMAC) Recommend that you cite this regulation in the permits. In the future if the regulation is amended or altered then this clause would be linked to the new regulation.	The citation has been added.
III.F.3.c			X	Why do you specify 30% of the mix water? Our reason for adding roughly 15% of the mix water first is to prevent head packing_.	In multiple observations, the Department observed that the initial addition of water clearly reduced PM emissions when dry material was added or the truck rocked. We have changed the number to 15% to match industry practice.
III.F.3.d			X	Clarify what this means. Could a water ring meet the intention of the requirement?	Dropping material into the truck displaces air already inside. This positive pressure tends to push the finer material back out through the fill

Paragraph	Applies to GCP 2	3	5	Issue	Resolution/Rationale
				[another individual] While all of the plants in my experience are constructed this way, some may not be. Also, this requirement may be at odds with central-mix plant design. [another individual] Does this also include fly ash?	opening. Department observations confirm that most plants use an aggregate curtain and it is effective. "Concentric" means an inner boot surrounded by an outer boot. "Aggregate curtain" means that the finer cementaceous material (which could include fly ash) is injected into the truck through the inner boot ONLY at times when heavier aggregate material is also being injected through the outer boot. The heaver material from the outer boot tends to entrain the flow of the lighter, finer cementaceous material, carrying it deeper into the truck and reducing back-flow. Since this seems to be a relatively common industry practice and costs little to implement, we are requiring it. As mentioned above, the Department can make adaptations for central mix plants, when we have a candidate plant to work with. Until that time, anything we did would be speculative. A water ring would not meet the intention of the requirement because it would not capture the fine fugitives unless it was running constantly, or at least every time cementaceous material was added. At another meeting, an operator observed that adding water and cement at the same time caused hard deposits to build up on the equipment.
III.F.4, 5, & 8			X	What about existing batch plants that have sock fabric baghouses without any kind of pressure	"Grandfathering" of pre-existing plants is not an option under this GCP. All plants will be required

Paragraph	Applies to GCP 2	3	5	Issue	Resolution/Rationale
				system on them? Is this going to be a problem?	to have a permit: either regular construction or GCP-5. As explained elsewhere, the requirement to measure delta-P is the key to allowing concrete plants to operate with unrestricted hours – something the industry said was important.
III.F.5 III.F.11 Tbl III.F.1	X X	 X X		Why have this table if there is a requirement for "no visible emissions across the property boundary? Does the 95 TPY Title V requirement apply to these permits? Should road emissions be counted, since they are fugitive?	Table was in previous versions of GCP 2 and 3. In a GCP the Department has the flexibility to require slightly more than statutory compliance. For concrete facilities, dust is a major public issue. In the GCP, the Department included fugitive dust emissions in calculating compliance with the 95 TPY requirement in Table III.G.1.
Table III.F.1			X	Are these efficiencies easily achievable or typical? Are all existing concrete batch plants required to do get a new permit? I am wondering how good the existing bag houses are. [another individual] This requirement should be more generic than "baghouse or fabric filter."	According to our Permitting group, these standards are used in permitting and the capability is backed by manufacturer's specs. Most New Mexico plants are currently operating under a NOI and do not have permits. Those that do are under a regular construction permit, since there hasn't been a GCP-5 up to now. Such plants may continue to operate under the regular permit. Most plants that don't have a permit will have to apply for one at this time, choosing between the regular construction permit or a GCP-5. It is not possible to measure delta-P across a sock filter. The modeling that established plant capacity limits was the based on the 99% efficiency.
III.F.6			X	Reiterate earlier comment about observer-sun-source orientation. Use specs from Method 9	Reiterate earlier answer. Familiarity with Method 9 is presumed, but Method 9 will not restrict the

Paragraph	Applies to GCP 2	3	5	Issue	Resolution/Rationale
				when using Method 22.	Departments ability to make a Method 22 reading when there other alternatives are unreasonable.
III.F.6			X	What do you mean by the term "Filter(s)" in this sentence? Does it include only the silo or also the baghouse?	This requirement refers to both the silo (or silos), and the filter (or filters) of whatever type the facility has chosen to use.
III.F.6			X	Does the "Total of five minutes" mean that the "emission standard" applies to each filter individually, or does it mean that the time is 5 minutes when simultaneously considering all filters?	The term "Filter" is defined in Section VI.B to include various filtering technologies. This requirement is referring collectively to a 'filtering unit," not to an individual bag within a baghouse. Each silo and filter (unit) will have it's own test observation and must individually stay within a 5 minute requirement.
III.F.7		X	X	I am concerned about the requirement for no visible emissions at the boundary. Base course and water on haul roads are 80-90% controls and do not result in “no visible emissions” It is possible that trucks coming in from outside could cause some emissions when they are crossing into the property and hope enforcement will understand that. When conducting modeling analysis, we have typically stopped including haul road segment in the last 25-50 meters to the property boundary.	The Department will not interpret visible emissions entering the property as a violation. It should be quite obvious which direction the wind is moving. The small setbacks in these GCPs are based on no visible emissions, and inherent in that is the owner/operator's responsibility to maintain road surfaces that meet the requirement. Physical layout is up to the Owner/Operator, but it would be a bad idea to place the haul road parallel to the restricted area perimeter for more than a short distance. Note that the requirement specifies "the perimeter of the Restricted Area," not the property boundary. Since the haul road is considered to end at the Restricted Area, the requirement does not apply to fugitive emissions generated outside of that area.

Paragraph	Applies to GCP 2	3	5	Issue	Resolution/Rationale
III.F.7			X	The "no visible emissions" standard is artificial and has no relationship to PSD increment or ambient air quality standards.	[see previous discussion on III.F.7]
III.F.8		X	X	Why is there a requirement for "vertical venting." [other similar comments]	The requirement for vertical venting has been limited to combustion sources only, where it is related to modeling inputs.
III.F.10		X		20 meters is a very tall stack; higher than we have ever seen. Why? Can it be reduced?	The requirement has been changed to 10 meters. The required height is listed in Part 72, Table C, as 10 meters, although when modeling Toxic emissions (not relevant in this instance), credit is given for additional stack height.
III.F.11			X	It implies that the fugitive emissions being discussed are from haul roads. Is this correct? Given that haul roads must cross the property boundary, it could be a problem for haul roads to meet the standard of less than 5 minutes in 2 hours.	This comment is addressing what is now III.F.7. The correct wording should have prevented visible emissions from crossing the perimeter of the "Restricted Area," not the Property Boundary. This requirement applies to all sources, and includes fugitive emissions. (per III.F.1) See responses above to III.F.7 for additional discussion of fugitive emissions and haul roads.
III.F.11.b			X	Usefulness of wheel washing is questionable, depending upon proximity to exit, and is expensive ($160K). Since trucks are already washed after filling, would that comply if haul roads inside the controlled area are surfaced per this GCP?	The wheel washing requirement is conditional, required only when the Facility is in close proximity to items listed in III.E.3. The department does not think that washing will increase track-out if reasonable cleanliness standards are maintained within the Area of Operations, and if the washing occurs at the restricted area perimeter. Whether the combination of paved roads and truck washing at the perimeter would constitute "wheel washing" is

Paragraph	Applies to GCP 2	3	5	Issue	Resolution/Rationale
					under consideration.
III.F.11b			X	For temporary operations of a portable plant, it is not practical to pave the entrance road. Some portion (but not all) could be required for permanent plants.	As in the previous response, this requirement is conditional. The wording is "pavement OR basecourse and surfactant." Note also that by definition, "haul roads" are that portion of the road that occurs within the "restricted area." In this restricted context, the road surfacing requirements are reasonable.
III.F.11b			X	I am aware of a project in one of the most out of the way locations in New Mexico. Yet it was within ½ mile of an occupied building and would have been required to pave their haul road and perhaps the "area of operations." I don't think your distinction between "Property Boundary," "Restricted Area," and "Area of Operations" is real, and this paving requirement is completely inappropriate.	a) The distinction is real. It is illustrated and explained in the GCP-5 Guidance Document. b) By definition, a haul road ends at the edge of the restricted area. c) Paving is not mandated. The requirement says "basecourse & surfactant OR paving." d) A remote location does not mean that the inhabitants of an occupied building are entitled to less protection than residents of an urban area.
III.F.11 (now III.F.10)			X	Your use of ½ mile distance in several places will, in practice, result in longer haul roads and more emissions.	The ½ mile separation has been eliminated in one instance and reduced to ¼ mile in another. However, this question indicates that the requirement was misinterpreted. A concrete plant, operating alone under a GCP, does not need to be ¼ mile from the items specified in the list. The ¼ mile separation applies only if another facility co-locates with the batch plant. (III.E.3) The ¼ mile parameter in III.F.10 does not require a longer road: it only specifies additional road controls. Lastly, by definition, a haul road ends at the edge

Paragraph	Applies to GCP 2	3	5	Issue	Resolution/Rationale
					of the restricted area, so haul-road length is unrelated to the ¼ mile restriction.
III.F.(new)			X	Suggest the addition of a new item, in lieu of the monitoring/recordkeeping in Section IV. "For a batch transit mix concrete plant (excluding central mix plants), an electronic sensor shall be installed that detects when a truck backs up to load concrete and automatically activates the baghouse."	If added, the hardware requirement would be located in III.F.3.f. The proposed "switch" would guarantee that the bag house was operating at the right time, but would do nothing to quantify how well it was operating: something that a pressure drop does indicate. As proposed, the activation sensor would not cover starting the baghouse when a cement delivery truck was filling the silo.
III.F.1 & IV.A.1	X			Why has the conveyer been added to this list? It wasn't on the previous version. If the crusher & screen are in compliance, the conveyer isn't going to be a problem. A bunch of extra readings will be required for compliance.	The crusher and screen have controls. Conveyers and drop-points, unless covered or enclosed, are not controlled. In this version, fugitive emissions are being included in total facility emissions. The Department did not specify controls but did establish an opacity limit
Table III.G.1	X	X	X	A) A facility with the stringent controls you have specified will not have emissions this high. Engines are already limited to 180 hp and I don't see how such an engine can release with 95 ton/year especially with the time restriction. SO2 emissions will also be negligible with the fuel limitation; TSP emissions cannot be this high with baghouses and no visible emissions unless they have about 100 acres to generate fugitives. Is there a reason why PM10 is not included in the table? B) Citizens who look at these numbers in a	Table III.G.1 is the definition of a "major source." The Department does not intend to permit Major Sources under any of the GCPs. The operational/production limits placed on each type of facility were back-calculated to ensure that the facility would remain below these limits. Fugitive emissions were included (but not mobile sources) and Particulate Matter was the limiting factor for GCP-2 and GCP-5. CO was the limiting factor for GCP-3. The table therefore includes extra parameters, but is defines the boundaries for Major Sources and we want to

Paragraph	Applies to GCP 2	3	5	Issue	Resolution/Rationale
				public notice will get very upset. HAPs inclusion at such high emission contradicts a previous exclusion whereby the facility may not mine/use any HAP. so where are all the HAPs coming from? C) Third what should we do about surrounding sources entry when doing modeling analysis. D) A facility with HAPs is supposed to be excluded from this application so I don't understand why you are including them in this table? If HAPs, why not include TAPs? E) Is it possible to come up with a reasonable emission rate based on throughput and the controls?	leave it intact. TSP includes PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ so by definition PM_{10} emissions will be less than 95 tons. The table does not say that there "will be" 95 tons of HAPS or TAPS; it says there must be less than that amount. By the same token, HAPs and TAPs were not excluded in the earlier requirement. Subsection I.B excluded facilities subject to a NESHAP or 20.2.72 NMAC, sections 400 – 499 (TAPs). But a facility is not "subject to" either unless its annual emissions are greater than 5 tons. The table may appear to over-portray the facility emissions, but the intent is to preclude Major Sources and the Department doesn't want to change the definition.
IV.A. & IV.B			X	[Lengthy statement that the monitoring and recordkeeping requirements are excessive, lacking justification, too costly, and ineffectual.]	Rather than repeat the questioner's statements verbatim, the Department's rationale is as follows: The only way we could circumvent individual modeling for each permit was to specify "no visible emissions crossing the perimeter of the Restricted Area." Visible emissions are determined by opacity readings, which can only be done under specific daylight conditions. The industry made it clear that much of their operation, particularly in the summertime, was pre-dawn. So, under this GCP, concrete batch plants are allowed to operate at any hour of the day or night.

Paragraph	Applies to GCP 2	3	5	Issue	Resolution/Rationale
					Unable to use opacity, we specified reasonable controls in section III.F. The physical presence of the controls can be verified by simple observation, but two additional pieces of information are required: 1) The department needs to know that the controls are turned on at the times when dust-emitting activities occur. 2) There needs to be some measurable physical parameter to prove that the control device is operating effectively. Capture velocity was initially considered. (duct velocity divided by the area of the open face of the hood) This seemed to lean too heavily into equipment specification and would have overly complicated compliance and verification testing. Instead, the parameter chosen was pressure drop across the "Filter." (includes baghouses, fabric, sock, and cartridge filters) Pressure drop and the loading activity status are the only monitoring requirements in the GCP. Requesting reading 4 times per hour, covers the possibility that the filter should be "on" (loading status is "active"), but for some reason is not. The department understands that when the loading status is "inactive," a zero delta-P is expected. Our initial formulation of this requirement was based on an incorrect assumption that all batch

Paragraph	Applies to GCP 2	3	5	Issue	Resolution/Rationale
					plants were computer controlled, and it would take minimal effort to connect a pressure gage to an automatic recording device. In recognition of cost, this requirement has been reduced to once per hour and smaller Facilities may record readings manually, if they wish. The questioner is correct (see other entries below) that a range may be more appropriate than a single number. A number that is too low could indicate that one or several filters have blown. A number that is too high may indicate that the filters are "blinded' and PM is bypassing the unit. Other states require monitoring of the pressure drop across filters. Ranges between 2-3 and 1-5 inches were mentioned in the public meeting. 4-inches was described as being "marginal." A manufacturer's suggested operating range is the easiest solution for most plants if the filter unit meets GCP performance requirements. However, if the Department specified a single numeric range for all units, hardware differences would be missed. As a result, the GCP provides another avenue, allowing the Facility to establish an operating range that meets the requirement for no-visible emissions. There is a linkage between Method 22 opacity readings and proper filter function. Assuming that there are no visible emissions, initial pressure reading with new filters should define the low end

Paragraph	Applies to GCP 2	3	5	Issue	Resolution/Rationale
					of the operational range. As the filters become loaded, the high-end of the operational range will be determined by the highest pressure at which there are no visible emissions. A facility may establish its own range; however, if visible emissions are witnessed while operating within the designated range the facility is still responsible. (i.e. some margin of safety might be appropriate when setting the range.)
IV.A.1			X	Clarify (as above) that Method 22 will follow guidelines from Method 9. [another individual] Is this monitoring/recordkeeping required only when the silo is being filled? Has a cost analysis been completed as to how this will affect a small (less than 50 yards/hour) operation? Most of the small businesses do not have this and I wonder how it will affect them.	See response to III.A.6 above. The Permit language says "each time a silo or concrete truck is being filled." The department is very sympathetic to small businesses and has made accommodations for small plants in the April 2006 version. (See subsection I.E) Cost alone is insufficient reason to exceed standards. This change was justified by calculating the smaller emissions that would result from reduced production activity.
IV.A.1	X			States that the operator shall take 6 minute opacity readings for each transfer point per month. Request clarification of the method required to demonstrate compliance with this condition. If the intent is to require operations to do these readings with Method 9, this condition	Method 9 is used to establish the initial opacity (IV.D.9 and 10), therefore, in order to produce comparable data, Method 9 must also be used for monitoring.

Paragraph	Applies to GCP 2	3	5	Issue	Resolution/Rationale
				is cumbersome and expensive to demonstrate compliance. If Method 22 is acceptable, please provide clarification it is allowed.	
IV.A.1		X	X	States that the operator needs to monitor and record all pressure across the filters at least 4 times per hour and at all times during the loading of silos. This can be very time consuming and difficult as many existing plants do not have the software mentioned in this permit. Recommend further investigation into this issue to discover possible alternatives for compliance.	In recognition of cost, this requirement has been reduced to once per hour and smaller Facilities are allowed to record readings manually.
IV.A.1			X	The requirement for monitoring is excessive. Why 4 times per hour? If plant isn't loading a silo, the baghouse is shut off and there won't be a reading. Not all plants are computer controlled. Purchase & installation of an on/off CEMs will cost ~$4K. Manual observations 4 times per hour would almost a full-time job. Requiring a manual observation would mean that someone was actually looking at the condition and would notice if something was wrong. Alternative proposal: 1st thing in the morning and once an hour thereafter.	In recognition of cost, this requirement has been reduced. (see previous) Original rationale:. From many observations, the Department presumed that the mix and loading at batch plants was computer controlled, and automatic monitoring wouldn't require anything new. A data-logger would save employee time and would be the most efficient method to archive and review data. The baghouse will be running when either the silo or a truck is being loaded. If there is no activity the loading status will be null, and a zero pressure drop is understood. But any time the loading status indicates "active," the negative pressure equipment must be 'on' and delta-P should be within the appropriate range for that facility.
IV.A.3		X		States that the operator shall continuously monitor the water inlet flow rate and pressure.	GCP-3 (Asphalt) allows wet scrubbers as an alternative. GCP-2 (Crushing-Screening) and

Paragraph	Applies to GCP 2	3	5	Issue	Resolution/Rationale
				Some facilities will likely be using a wet scrubber therefore this information would not be pertinent. Recommend specifying who needs to do this	GCP-5 (Concrete) do not allow the use of wet scrubbers. The flow rate and delta-P parameters characterize the effective function of a scrubber. The Department wants to know both of these parameters if a wet scrubber is being used.
IV.B	X	X		Provide some kind of format for what is expected in record keeping.	The Department deliberately did not specify a format to minimize the impact of recordkeeping. A facility may use existing records such as invoices and load-tickets to meet the intent of this requirement. We will provide examples of recordkeeping but they should not be construed as required format.
IV.B.3.d	X	X	X	Why is this record-keeping item here, if there is no related requirement?	The related requirements are in Table III.G.1. The department does not intend to permit major sources under a GCP. The primary emission from concrete facilities and Crusher/screens is PM. Particulate emissions result from equipment, processing activities, filter efficiencies, fugitives, and road traffic. For Asphalt plants, CO is the limiting factor. CO emissions come from dryers, burners, heaters, and engines. The Department has limited the size of each facility, which implies a corresponding limitation on haul road trips (incoming raw material and outgoing product). The haul road emissions are based on length and the road surfacing requirements in III.F. The Department has verified that these facilities are, in

Paragraph	Applies to GCP 2	3	5	Issue	Resolution/Rationale
					general, below the 95 TPY cap. However, every facility is different (e.g. more trips with partial loads, smaller/larger capacity trucks, longer or shorter haul roads, etc.). The Department will track road trips on GCP-3 to determine compliance for CO, and on GCP-2 and GCP-5 in the interest of possibly refining the limits in the next iteration.
IV.B.3.d	X	X	X	Could the number of tickets (multiplied by 2) be construed as meeting the number of haul road trips.	This would work for incoming and outgoing product trucks, but other records would need to be kept for raw material delivery (e.g. cement trucks).
IV.B.3.e	X	X	X	How does the number of gallons relate to the permit. Suggest you delete the requirement for quantity.	This requirement has been in GCP-2, GCP-3, and is in most regular construction permits. Fuel invoices document all fuel sales and retaining them imposes no additional requirement. In GCP-3, Facilities that burn waste oil will be of particular significance in estimating emissions.
IV.C.1.c	X	X	X	In the event of equipment failure, this requirement would require the facility to file a notice with the Department and then shut down during the 15-day waiting period.	Under normal operation, equipment replacement can be anticipated and the Department wants advance notice. However, it is not our intent to force a permitted facility to shut-down if a piece of equipment fails without warning. The requirement has been changed to read: "Prior to but no earlier than fifteen (15) days before any changes in equipment,…" This allows the notification to occur immediately when a failure occurs, and while the replacement unit is being installed. There is no waiting period for Department approval.
IV.D.1	X	X	X	a) Why are we looking at engines as small as	(See also the response to I.A.3.h)

Paragraph	Applies to GCP 2	3	5	Issue	Resolution/Rationale
				180 HP? b) Couldn't you make the requirement "any engine emitting over 80 TPY must be tested? c) Is there a written Department policy on approved "alternative methods"? d) Who (company name) can conduct these tests? [another individual] I am glad that small operations will not have to do initial compliance tests for engines, but how was this site rating chosen? Why not 300 hp?	A) The Department has always required testing for engines of this size because emissions could top 25 TPY. But, because most concrete plants weren't permitted up to this point, they weren't aware of the requirement. B) The Department is permitting the whole plant, not just the engine, and we need to look at total emissions. C) The requirement has been changed to allow use of portable analyzers for NOx and CO if Department guidelines are followed; however, the Department will still have the right to request Method testing in specific cases. D) The Department does not recommend contractors. (industry representatives who were present mentioned several names.)
IV.D.1	X	X	X	In I.A.3.h you allow only "Internal combustion engines less than 180 HP." Now you are requiring engines greater than 180 hp site rating to be tested for compliance. Which is it?	The initial requirement no longer caps engine size. Testing is be required only for those engines over 180hp.
IV.D.1	X	X	X X	A) The compliance testing section seems overly excessive. Why are we looking at engines as small as 180 HP? AP-42 factors should be sufficient to confirm compliance below 95 TPY. Engines twice that size, operating 8760 hours per year would be hard put to produce 25 TPY. B) Is the boiler referred to the hot water heater for winter operation? Why test it for such a	The GCP covers the entire facility, not a single engine or heater. The setbacks are quite small and hours of operation are unlimited. Therefore, the department is looking at total emissions from all sources. The "heater" mentioned refers to the hot water heater for winter operation. Heaters are fairly

Paragraph	Applies to GCP 2	3	5	Issue	Resolution/Rationale
				limited use? Compliance testing is unreasonable in the summer if that is when the facility is initially set up. C) Opacity tests (method 9) make sense for a heater burning fuel oil but not for one burning gaseous fuel.	simple devices and some are capable of burn multiple fuels. It is more equitable and simpler to require testing of all heaters. It is possible to start and operate the heater during the summer in order to conduct the test Conducting tests "piecemeal" (some now, some later) would be problematic for the Department and could increase the Facility's cost. It would also require records from both parties, that a test requirement had not yet been completed.
IV.D.1	X	X	X	While fixed plants are connected to the power grid, the Department needs to consider the use of highline generators to drive portable plants on road projects.	Generators, where power is not available, have been added to the equipment list (I.A.3) and are required to meet the applicable testing requirements in section IV.D.
IV.D.2			X	The sentence "Compliance tests from previous permits…." should be struck. There are no previous permits.	This sentence allows data from existing compliance tests to be used. Owners registering for a GCP may already hold a regular construction permit
IV.D.3		X	X	If a baghouse is replaced it seems like a simple visual observation is all that needs to be done to verify no visible emissions, not another $3000 compliance test.	While a new baghouse should, in theory, produce "no visible emissions," the replacement unit may, instead, be a used baghouse. Earlier comments objected to manufacturer's specs (possibly out of date) as the only method to establish an single operating pressure. Lacking compliance test results on a replacement unit, the Department would know nothing about its operation.
IV.D.4	X			What about facilities that lease and operate equipment for a very short period? I have a	Leased equipment at the Facility is subject to the same requirements as owned equipment, whether

Paragraph	Applies to GCP 2	3	5	Issue	Resolution/Rationale
				client who leases screening equipment for 60 days and this testing requirement will be tough to meet especially since the Facility also has to provide a test protocol at least thirty days ahead of the test.	initially present or added at a later date. In particular, requirements for Notification (of a change, IV.C.1.c) and Compliance Testing (Subsection IV.D) are applicable.
IV.D.7		X		Why is there a requirement to monitor water pressure and flow rate on the scrubber during engine tests? This looks like an unintended cross-over between two unrelated things.	This was unintentional and the language has been removed.
IV.D.8	X	X	X	Plant operation is variable and it is not possible to run a generator test at 90% if there is no electrical load. Suggest you drop testing requirement and use AP-42 or manufacturers data to verify that emissions are less than 95 TPY.	AP-42 is a general average, not specific to individual units. And, as pointed our earlier, Manufacturers data may not be applicable after several years. The purpose of compliance testing is to establish emissions under load. It might not be possible to operate the complete Facility at 90% for an entire hour, or even selected pieces of equipment. However, the Facility and all equipment should be operated at representative loads, as close to 90 % as is realistically possible
IV.D.9			X	A single test on a new filter is not the same as determining the range of pressure drops across a filter up to the point at which visible emissions may occur. I'm concerned that a compliance person would require the facility to maintain the initial pressure drop (even in the absence of visible emissions) or would interpret this requirement to justify an enforcement action.	The requirement has been changed to establish a range of allowable operation. The Facility is required to operate within that range, and regardless of pressure drop, remains responsible for meeting the "no visible emissions" requirement in III.F.7.
IV.D.10	X	X	X	The compliance report turn-around seems too tight. For method 9, 30 days may be OK but for	The language has been changed to 45 days.

Paragraph	Applies to GCP 2	3	5	Issue	Resolution/Rationale
				NOx and CO, 45 days seems more appropriate.	
IV.D.11	X	X	X	This is meaningless if leased equipment is hired for less than three months, because the facility will cease operations by the time the testing is completed and submitted.	The Facility is required to have a permit before operating (II.A.2). Equipment may be added with notification to the Department (IV.C.1.c). Whether part of the initial operation or added later, leased equipment must compliance tested . Test results, when submitted to the Department, must show compliance with all applicable requirements. Continuing to operate any piece of equipment after a failed compliance test will be considered a permit violation.
VI.B.1	X	X	X	Why is the Department canceling the permit if construction isn't done within 1 year? What if there is a health emergency in the permit holder's family? [another individual] Why do we have two different time lines here? When will the department cancel the registration in one year	Clarification: The key word is "may" cancel. The Department has the option, but has never taken a permit away under this condition. The only time we might exercise it is if the first issued (inactive) permit is preventing another permit from constructing near-by. If the owner/operator has a family emergency, he or she can notify the Department of the circumstances and request additional leeway. Note that IV.B.2 uses the word "shall." If the permit is inactive for 5 years, the Department does not have a choice, and must cancel the permit. This is why we must be notified within 30 days when a facility ceases operation. (IV.C.1.a)
VI.B.1	X	X	X	Suggest that you strike this section entirely. Language carry over from 20.2.72 is not appropriate for this type of permit. Portable concrete plants are not "constructed," they are	See previous response.

Paragraph	Applies to GCP 2	3	5	Issue	Resolution/Rationale
				"field set-up." If an out of state plant obtains a GCP-5 permit for portable operation, it may be more than one year between jobs in New Mexico. Similarly, cancellation if operation "ceases" for five years is not appropriate for this type of permit. What does "cease" mean in the context of a portable operation?	
VI.E.1	X	X		Sounds awkward. Why does a new facility fall under the category of revision of the permit.	"Facilities registered under a previous version of GCP-2 & 3 must re-register (complying with any new or changed requirements) within the time defined by the transition schedule. A new facility (not previously registered) that wants to use GCP-2 or 3 must comply with Subsection II.A of this permit."
Definition	X	X	X	Production Throughput is not a correct definition, as it would apply to co-located operations: think hot mix plant or aggregate processing units. More thought here.	In the previous draft, the term "production throughput" was defined in Sub-section VI-B, and was used in conjunction with the Manufacturer's facility rating. The term has been variously replaced in this version by "production," production capacity," or "production rate."